

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/083,625	(	02/26/2002	W. Jerry Easterling	VULVODYNIA 1785			
	7590	04/30/2004		EXAMINER			
DAVID G. I	HENRY		KWON, BRIAN YONG S				
900 Washingt P.O. Box 147		ue	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
Waco, TX 7			1614				
				DATE MAILED: 04/30/2004			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Т	Application	No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary			10/083,625		EASTERLING, W. JERRY					
			Examiner		Art Unit					
	•		Brian S Kwo	on	1614					
	NG DATE of this commun	nication appe				dress				
Period for Reply					0) 50014					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).										
Status										
1) Responsive	to communication(s) file	ed on <u>16 Jaı</u>	nuary 2004.							
	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.									
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.									
Disposition of Claims										
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ⊠ Claim(s) 4-7 is/are rejected.  7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.										
Application Papers			,							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.										
Priority under 35 U.	S.C. § 119									
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.										
	son's Patent Drawing Review ure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 o			4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal (6) Other:	ate	<sup>-</sup> O-152)				

Application/Control Number: 10/083,625

Art Unit: 1614

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 1. Claims 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mak et al. (US 2002/0198136 A1).

This rejection is analogous to the original rejection.

## Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed January 16, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's argument takes position that Mak et al. conversely teaches away from the instant invention since the continuous dosing procedure would result in more inconvenience and

Art Unit: 1614

expense to the patient, while the more exact dosing requirements taught in the present invention would ease these burdens.

This argument is found unpersuasive at all. Although Mak expresses a preference for a continuous delivery of said compound in a vaginal suppository, a cervical ring or an intrauterine device, at the same time the reference provides the delivery of said compound in sustained or controlled delivery topical formulations (page 11, para. 105 and page 12, para. 112). Unlike applicant's alleged interpretation of "continuous delivery" in a sense of "frequent administration of said compound", the referenced "continuous delivery" rather points to the delivery of said compound in longer period of the time by controlled or sustained delivery system or device. Unlike applicant's alleged "teaching away" of Mak, Mak provides motivation for the ordinary skill in the art to deliver said compound in controlled or sustained topical delivery system or device. As discussed in preceding comments, the examiner is not convinced that there is a sufficient teaching away in the art to overcome the obviousness rejection over Mak et al. (2002/0198136 A1).

Therefore, the examiner maintains that the determination of a dosage form or concurrent administration regimen or frequency is well within the level of one having ordinary skill in the art, and the artisan would be motivated to determine optimum amounts or concurrent administration regimen or frequency to get the maximum effect of the drug. Hence, the reference makes obvious the instant invention.

Application/Control Number: 10/083,625

Art Unit: 1614

#### Conclusion

3. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian Kwon whose telephone number is (571) 272-0581. The examiner can normally be reached Tuesday through Friday from 9:00 am to 7:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marianne Seidel, can be reached on (571) 273-0584. The fax number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-1600.

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 10/083,625

Art Unit: 1614

Brian Kwon Patent Examiner AU 1614

> ZOHREH FAY PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 1600

Eahr Fry